10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BRIAN M. McINTYRE, Cochise County Attorney BY: SARA V. RANSOM, Deputy County Attorney Arizona State Bar No. #024099 P.O. Drawer CA Bisbee, Arizona 85603 (520) 432-8700 attymeo@cochise.az.gov



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF COCHISE

STATE OF ARIZONA,) NO. CR201800252
Plaintiff,)))
JUSTIN ALEXANDER COPELAND,) MOTION FOR) NO CONTACT ORDER
Defendant.) [expedited consideration requested])

The State of Arizona, by and through County Attorney Brian M. McIntyre and his Deputy, Sara V. Ransom, in the interests of justice, moves for entry of a no contact order between Defendant Justin Alexander Copeland ("Defendant") and Sara Bailey, formerly Sara Copeland, the victim representative of victim R.H. Moreover, because Defendant and Ms. Bailey are conspiring to commit one or more felonies in their recorded communications, the State asks for expedited consideration and resolution of this Motion.

I. BACKGROUND

On November 17, 2017, then 13-year-old R.H. notified school officials that her step father Justin Copeland had been molesting her for years. R.H. completed a forensic interview later that same day, which confirmed her previous disclosures to school officials. Defendant did not deny R.H.'s accusations, instead claiming that he had "sexsomnia" and was unaware of the repeated molestations of R.H. Defendant was Indicted on 50 counts of molestation and an alternative count of Continuous Sexual Abuse of a Minor.

The matter proceeded to trial on March 25, 2019. At trial, Defendant altered his defense to claim that he had no opportunity to molest R.H. because there were always numerous people in the house. Sara Bailey, R.H.'s biological mother and Defendant's exwife, testified that she was always around Defendant in the family home, which supported Defendant's new defense.

R.H. testified at trial on April 1, 2019. Although she did have make some inconsistent statements, R.H.'s testimony was similar to her original forensic interview from November 2017. On April 5, 2019, Defendant was found guilty on all 50 counts of molestation alleged by the State. On April 8, the jury found that the State had proven that each count was a dangerous crime against children punishable pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-705, and further that the State had demonstrated two aggravating factors—emotional, physical or financial harm to the victim and that Defendant had abused a position of trust.

Defendant, who was not previously in custody, was taken into custody on April 5, 2019. Since he was taken into custody, Defendant has been in contact with the victim representative in this case, Sara Bailey. Two recent calls, which appear to have taken place earlier this week, include multiple requests by the Defendant that Sara Bailey discuss R.H.'s testimony with R.H. and record R.H. recanting or altering her previous testimony. On the calls, Ms. Bailey agrees with Defendant's requests, and further states that she will send the recordings to Defendant's attorney, Kevin Oursland. The State will make the jail calls available to defense counsel and this Court for *in camera* review.

II. A No Contact Order Must Be Entered To Prevent Further Criminal Violations and Protect R.H.

The State is filing a Complaint against Defendant and Ms. Bailey alleging conspiracy to commit hindering prosecution and conspiracy to commit witness tampering. In the meantime, however, Defendant is engaging in communications with Ms. Bailey in furtherance of additional felonious acts against his victim, R.H. Because Ms. Bailey is apparently intent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

24 25 upon supporting Defendant in this effort, a no contact order should be immediately entered. A No Contact Order is necessary to not only to prevent further conspiratorial acts between Defendant and Ms. Bailey, but to protect R.H. from the on-going manipulation and harms of Defendant.

Sentencing in this case is set to proceed on June 3, 2019 at 1:30 p.m. By this No Contact Order, the State does not intend or wish to interfere with or unduly burden the ability of counsel for the Defendant to prepare for mitigation or sentencing in this matter. The State thus asks that the Court allow counsel for the Defendant or any investigators retained by counsel for the Defendant to interview witnesses in the ordinary course. The State's does not, however, authorize any form of contact with the victim, R.H., and further asks that Defendant be prohibited from engaging in any direct or indirect contact with Sara Bailey, as such contacts are clearly in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy to further victimize R.H., a young child and a material witness in this case. The State further reserves its right to seek a forfeiture by wrong-doing ruling in any future proceedings in this matter. State v. Franklin, 232 Ariz. 556, 558, 307 P.3d 983, 985 (Ct. App. 2013). A proposed form of Order is attached hereto.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 11th day of April, 2019.

COCHISE COUNTY ATTORNEY

BY:

Deputy County Attorney

ORIGINAL filed this 11th day of April, 2019 with the Clerk of the Cochise County Superior Court.

COPIES e-mailed and mailed this 11th day of April, 2019 to:

The Honorable Laura Cardinal Cochise County Superior Court, Division 1